

Date: Mon, 2 Aug 93 18:13:46 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #280  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Mon, 2 Aug 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 280

Today's Topics:

                    ARRL and it's members (2 msgs)  
                    ARRL opposes temporary permits  
                    Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer  
                    Immature children masquarading as HAMS  
Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah (2 msgs)  
                    OOPS! Wrong Signature file  
                    STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!  
                    Subject: 1947 No Code survey  
Technicians can use CW, was Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Sun, 01 Aug 93 22:55:55 -0400  
From: swrinde!emory!dragon!nj8j!ben@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARRL and it's members  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

> Fair enough, Ed. Most of the discussion on this newgroup has centered  
> around the Codeless Technician license. First of all, the ARRL \*is\* the  
> respresentative organization by and for the amateur radio community in  
> the United States. Several years ago, the ARRL (after receiving support  
> from our fraternity, including mine) put forth a proposal to the FCC that  
> a codeless entry-level license be created. This license would convey all  
> amateur privileges 222 MHz (then 220) and above.

>  
> My question for you is, why didn't this proposal pass, and why do we now  
> have something completely different than what we approved?

If I remember correctly, it ran up against what has been an FCC mantra for the past few years: "That would require changes to the software used for processing licenses, which we currently don't have the money for". Now that the FCC is in the process of changing over to new computer systems for the license processing application, perhaps that old mantra will go away.

At this point, what we need is a group of volunteer programmer/analysts who will check over the analysis and design of the new system and insure that there's enough flexibility built in that the FCC won't have to invoke the old mantra.

Ben

```
+-----+-----+
| Ben Coleman NJ8J          | "All that is not eternal is    |
| AX.25:  NJ8J@W4QO.#EAL.#ATL.GA.USA.NA | eternally irrelevant." |
| Internet: ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us          | C. S. Lewis |
+-----+-----+
```

-----  
Date: Sun, 1 Aug 1993 21:01:51 GMT  
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!spool.mu.edu!  
darwin.sura.net!perot.mtsu.edu!raider!theporch!jackatak!root@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARRL and it's members  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:  
> jeg7e@livia.acs.Virginia.EDU (Jon Gefaell) writes:  
> > I've directed prospective new Amateurs to email Luck Hurder asking for  
> > the New Hams packet which is supposed to include local testing session  
> > information, etc... It was never received.  
> >  
> > The same fellow persevered and obtained his license, then sent mail again  
> > requesting the Public Service Manual, again, it never arrived.  
>  
> I think your first mistake was to write to Luck Hurder in the first  
> place. In all the times I've tried to reach him, I have been out of luck  
> (with no pun intended).

I gotta shove my \$0.02 in here for Luck.

I have never had a problem getting ahold of him (via 'Net e-mail). He



Date: 2 Aug 1993 15:08:32 -0700  
From: techbook.com!techbook.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael O'Brien (obrien@Aero.org) wrote:

: In article <1993Jul23.171048.21757@cyphyn.UUCP>, randy@cyphyn.UUCP (Randy)  
writes:

: |> The FCC has access to the computer 1 ( one ) day a week.

: |>

: |> I saw that about 30-40 posts ago.

: Well, I'll reiterate what I said about the same length of time ago: beginning  
: in October, the FCC will start beta-testing a new licensing system that  
: will permit the electronic submission of 610 forms, which, if all goes as  
: planned, will come into full use around the first of the year, and will  
: cut the time from exam to license arrival to 4-5 days. Maybe my post  
: didn't make it out; I saw not one response to it.

: --

: Mike O'Brien

: obrien@aero.org

My prediction, (I hope I'm wrong):

1. There will be an extremely long period of installation/evaluation/  
implementation of the new computer system.
2. Millions of dollars will be extravagantly spent.
3. The license handling time will be reduced from the FCC's currently quoted  
12 weeks to ONLY 3 months!

Your tax dollars at work.

Gene

--

Those who beat their swords into plowshares  
are destined to plow for those who don't.

genew@techbook.COM

Please direct flames to: genew@ucant.gethere.frmhere

-----

Date: Mon, 2 Aug 1993 12:59:39 GMT  
From: usc!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!  
news.iastate.edu!IASTATE.EDU!wjturner@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Immature children masquarading as HAMS

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

OK, time for another commentary. This code/nocode debate has gone on long enough. (Actually, way too long!) We can't get rid on the code requirement completely because of international agreements, so forget that idea for now. As for lowering the required speed, I am all in favor of it. However, B&Ming won't help. If someone wants extended HF privileges, then they must take the code tests, at least until they are changed which may be a \*long\* time. Notice I don't think there is the need for the code tests there once was, yet I did take the 13 wpm (I'm working on 20 wpm), and my favorite mode of operation is CW.

The thing that really bugs me is that I've \*never\* heard any complaining about HF privileges except on rec.radio.amateur.\*, and then the \*CHILDREN\* on this group decide that the best way to get their points across is to call each other names!! \*GROW UP\*!!!!!!

I find it extremely funny that the Technicians (OK, no-codes, if you will) are, for the most part, taking a back seat to the \*no-clues\* that are arguing. Yes, I am talking about all the General, Advanced, and Amateur Extra licensees who are complaining about the way the Amateur Service is going, and they refuse to do anything but B&M. I especially love the Advanced class ham who argues that the 13 wpm test is completely legitimate, but the 20 wpm test should go. Seems to me like someone thinks everyone should do what he did, but he should not have to do anymore than he already has, or as he says, "without any additional effort. Hence, clueless."

Sounds like a no-clue to me!

--

Will Turner, N0RDV	-----
wjturner@iastate.edu	"Are you going to have any professionalism,
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu	or am I going to have to beat it into you?"
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov	-----

-----  
Date: 2 Aug 93 07:26:54 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>

> > \* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

> I believe that's obvious. Would you support beefed-up written exams,  
> with perhaps the removal of the published question pool?

>

Yes!! Yes! Wholeheartedly yes!

73,  
Peter Laws  
N5UWY/AA, V31WY, VE2???

Peter Laws | "The '90s are gonna make the '60s|plaws@uafhp.uark.edu  
n5uwy@ka5bml.ar.usa.noam| look like the '50s" --D. Hopper|plaws@uafsysb.bitnet

-----  
Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1993 00:58:04 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Why \*is\* the question pool published? The only reason I've heard given is that it ensures that the applicant receives an officially sanctioned exam. That sounds like an excuse as opposed to a reason. If the VEC and VE teams can't be trusted to give proper exams, then why are we trusting them to administer them in the first place?

Perhaps a better option is to try and make the pool large enough to make memorizing the questions self defeating. I suggested before that a question generator program be used as it could surely handle a large majority of the current question pool.

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: Mon, 2 Aug 1993 12:12:27 GMT  
From: pipex!bnr.co.uk!corpgate!nrtpa038!bnr.ca!harp@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: OOPS! Wrong Signature file  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

My Ole buddy Danny Stone (WB4ETY) put a new revision of the news reader on my computer. At the same time he gave me his signature file. I didn't realize it until I read something I posted.

Now he is on vacation and I can't even yell at him. I've got to fix it myself. Oh well what are friends for?

I hope he gets lots of flaming E mail he doesn't deserve.

I always know when he uses my computer.

He cleans the whiteout off the  
screen.

```
*****
* Alan Harp K4PB      *      Bell-Northern Research      *      CW FOREVER      *
* mail: harp@bnr.ca  *      Research Triangle Park, NC   *
*****
```

-----

Date: Sun, 1 Aug 1993 19:39:16 GMT  
From: haven.umd.edu!darwin.sura.net!perot.mtsu.edu!raider!theporch!jackatak!  
root@ames.arpa  
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dts@banyan.com (Daniel Senie) writes:

```
> |> Then,
> |> if they'd only send some of that coffee to the NYC/LI Section Manager
> |> to get him to answer his mail more often than once every couple of
> |> months...:-) [Is this a common problem with SCMs? Volunteering and
> |> then deciding they don't want the job?]
>
> Vote for someone else next time, or better yet, run for the job yourself! I
> decided to do just that up here in Western Massachusetts. I'd like to see
> better communications among the members of the sections and have ideas
> on how to do that. Therefore, I decided to take a crack at it myself.
> If I win, it'll mean big time commitment, but it is for a good cause, IMHO.
```

Congratulations, Dan, and very good luck with your candidacy. I am  
running against an incumbent who appears only during election years  
and who seems to avoid long range thinking.

However, I am not going after our Section Manager, who does a quite  
creditable job. I am filing nomination petitions for Delta Division  
Director, and seek to add some technical understanding and knowledge  
(and access to the collective wisdom of the 'Net at the Board of  
Director level ;^).

The process will be difficult, too, for the incumbent, while far  
younger chronologically than I, is everything Wayne Green calls an OF,  
and I like to believe there is much yet for me to learn.

Best of Luck... Hope to see you in Newington or elsewhere.  
Join up and help us change things for the better!

Jack

-----

-----

What CW sub-bands?! I no you mean "where there is only CW", but that isn't what you are saying.



> The whole thing sounds pretty self limiting without the Morse code  
> requirement.

Could be, could be.

--

```
Will Turner,  N0RDV      -----  
wjturner@iastate.edu    | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |  
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |  
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----
```

-----

Date: (null)

From: (null)

>Just why did the FCC or the VEC (or whatever portion of alphabet soup  
>responsible for how the tests are setup) split the element 3 test into  
>two parts?

That was part of Novice Enhancement (3/21/87) - the plan that was to save the  
220 MHz band for amateur radio since all the new novices would instantly jump  
on 220 MHz to chat. Of course, given that in many areas of the country having  
2 people with 220 MHz gear seems to be remarkable event, it's no wonder it  
didn't exactly work out.

As it was - it was Technician Enhancement and that resulted in the owners of  
the older rigs having to buy crystals so they could tune 28.1 to 28.5...8)  
(since 28.6 used to be the "calling" frequency on 10m, the default mixer  
crystals would be for 28.5 to whatever.).

The FCC makes the rules (requirements for tests), the VECs make up the tests  
per the FCC requirements. I remember a big surge in Tech apps just before  
3/21/87 and a surge in Novice apps just after...and a boom in 10m operation.

part of the break in 3 to 3A and 3B was based on "starting friction" - don't  
want to make the step too tall. as it was, you end up with a test per license  
and there's a certain symmetry about that.

bill wb9ivr

-----

Date: Mon, 02 Aug 1993 16:55:36 GMT

From: news.mentorg.com!mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <eya97B9w165w@nraven.wariat.org>, <23bgv2INNdl1@network.ucsd.edu> ,

<CAztu8.53C@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>  
Reply-To : Hank\_Oredson@mentorg.com  
Subject : Re: ARRL and its members

In article <CAztu8.53C@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, jreese@NeoSoft.com (Jim Reese) writes:

|> In article <23bgv2INNdl1@network.ucsd.edu> brian@nothing.ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:

|> >The clear counter to what you and I and others see the ARRL doing wrong  
|> >is for us to petition and comment on petitions \*DIRECTLY\* before the FCC.  
|>

|> Hear, hear! It's about the only way you have to make a voice heard in  
|> Washington...

|>  
|> >Whether you are a member or not, the ARRL claims to represent you.  
|> >It therefore behooves you to criticize them when you believe they are  
|> >wrong, and to laud them when you believe they are right. Be sure the  
|> >ARRL knows what you think - and if your non-membership is a symbol of  
|> >your disgust with the organization, be sure you have told them so.

|>  
|>  
|> I did just this in the form of a letter to Dave Sumner. He didn't even  
|> bother to reply...further adding to my disgust.

|>  
|>  
|> >\*I have made no secret of this: the reason I'm not a member of the  
|> >ARRL is that I believe that many of their actions do not represent my  
|> >views as an amateur, and are in many ways harmful to the service.  
|> >I have felt this way ever since the imposition of the repeater policies  
|> >of the early 70's, and continue to believe that whenever the ARRL is  
|> >faced with a new technology, their first reaction is to suppress or  
|> >contain it.

|>  
|> Ditto. Couldn't have said it better myself.

|>  
|> --  
|> Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Bad times bring out the best in Texans, good times  
|> jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | bring out the worst." --Molly Ivins  
|>

Although I tend to agree with the ideas above, I choose to remain a member, and try and help vote out the folks that do not represent my views, and help to vote in the folks who do.

Remaining a member MAY result in better response from HQ, but this has NOT been my experience.

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics  
Internet : hank\_oredson@mentorg.com  
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NA

-----  
Date: 2 Aug 1993 11:49:17 -0700  
From: usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!spool.mu.edu!olivea!apple.com!apple.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <23bgv2INNd11@network.ucsd.edu>, <CAztu8.53C@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <1993Aug02.165536.14244@news.mentorg.com>  
Subject : Re: ARRL and its members

>In article <CAztu8.53C@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, jreese@NeoSoft.com (Jim Reese) writes:  
>|>  
>|> I did just this in the form of a letter to Dave Sumner. He didn't even  
>|> bother to reply...further adding to my disgust.

Did you include an IRC or a green stamp? :-)

Just kidding. On the serious side, don't let that expericence reflect on the rest of the League.

During the code-free license debate, I wrote my Section Manager, my Division Director and K1ZZ voicing an opinion.

My section manager replied by e-Mail (hi, Steve).

Even though my Director did not agree with me, he wrote a nice reply at the back of his QSL card, saying that he would take my views into consideration. Guess there were enough people with views like mine afterall, based on what the League finally did.

Well, maybe K1ZZ was a very busy person. Not a single ping.

73,

Kok Chen, AA6TY kchen@apple.com  
Apple Computer, Inc.

P.S. The HQ staffers are WONDERFULLY responsive and friendly, both on the net and on the phone.

-----  
Date: Mon, 2 Aug 93 18:18:04 GMT  
From: ncrigw2.ncr.com!ncrhub2!torynews!kevin@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930728.114323.7q4.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>,  
<RN7F8B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <RFM.93Jul31150433@urth.eng.sun.com>  
Subject : Re: Real CBers

In article <RFM.93Jul31150433@urth.eng.sun.com> rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) writes:

>  
>Actually us code-frees have less trouble reading this stuff than you coders  
>seem to, we just use our superior technical knowledge and pipe it through a  
>shell script. Not that we generally bother reading anything from sbs  
>anyway...  
>

Ah yes, I guess it \*does\* take superior technical knowledge to grab a shell script that someone else already wrote and posted to this group, and figure out how to run it. What do you do for an encore?

--  
[] [] [][] [][] Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ NCR Torrey Pines  
[] [] [] [] [] kevin.sanders@torreypinesca.ncr.com (619) 597-3602  
[] [] [][] [][] kevin%beacons@cyber.net  
[] [] [] [] []  
[] [] [] [] [][] Dump MS-DOS. Prevent Programmer Burnout with Linux.

-----  
Date: Mon, 2 Aug 93 12:33:02 GMT  
From: pipex!uknet!uos-ee!ee.surrey.ac.uk!M.Willis@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930730.111225.8M3.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>,  
<1993Aug01.161816.153259@locus.com>, <CB47tB.1Bz@fms.com>  
Subject : Re: Real CBers

In article <CB47tB.1Bz@fms.com>, andrews@fms.com (Andrew Sargent N8OFS) writes:  
|> In article <1993Aug01.161816.153259@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:  
|> >In article <930730.111225.8M3.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>  
system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:  
|> >>M.Willis@ee.surrey.ac.uk (Mike Willis) writes:  
|> >>  
|> >>> Yes. CODELESS != CLUELESS.

|> >>>  
|> >>>  
|> >>> All this stuff amuses me as in the UK we have had a codeless licence for many  
|> >>> years. A large number of technical competants have taken advantage of this.  
|> >>> VHF upwards is so much more rewarding than HF.  
|> >>  
|> >>Two things, this is the United States, not the United Kingdom and  
|> >>secondly, to each his own. Some people are perfectly happy to remain in  
|> >>VHF/UHF and others aren't.  
|> >  
Excuse me but this is definately not the USA. The world is more than just US  
interests you know.

Mike

-----

Date: Mon, 02 Aug 93 16:21:59 GMT  
From: csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!  
lando.la.locus.com!dana@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930730.111225.8M3.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>,  
<1993Aug01.161816.153259@locus.com>, <1993Aug01.205012.12573@anomaly.sbs.com>c  
Subject : Re: Real CBers

In article <1993Aug01.205012.12573@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev.  
Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>

>>You know, I've heard you and Deignan complaining about this. I'm very  
>>active on the local VHF repeaters, I'm a board member for a ham club of  
>>over 200 people, we have dozens of newly licensed Technicians, and I  
>>have yet to hear a single complaint about HF access without CW.

>

>Gee, Danie, guess you just don't read rec.radio.amateur.\* as closely as  
>Tony and I do, then.

Well, Mikey, I \*do\* read rec.radio.amateur.\* closely, and I have seen some  
people comment that requiring CW for HF doesn't seem to make much sense  
any more. However, these comments usually come from people with licenses  
greater in class than Technician, so I don't count them as "No-codes  
whining for HF privileges", because they aren't.

The vast majority of whining I've heard is from you, about a problem  
that simply does not seem to exist.

I'm not certain you've \*ever\* made a positive contribution to the  
rec.radio.\* groups, and you certainly work hard at being an ass.  
Maybe the "no-clues" bug you so much because it frightens you how  
much you identify with them, I can't say for sure.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ            | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136                | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466       | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #280  
\*\*\*\*\*